

FREE CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Volume II.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1866.

Number 5

Still further illustrations of the Limitation of the Powers of the Assembly.

A writer in the *Presbyterian* of Oct. 13th, signing himself "A Minority Man," and whom we suspect to be Rev Dr. Boardman, falling in with our own line of argument and illustration of the same date, proceeds to cite authorities from the discussions of 1832-7; and among them from the great speech of Mr. Winchester, of which we published so large a part the same week.

But this writer brings out some additional authorities which we doubt not our readers will be glad to have. We therefore re-publish here the latter half of the article. After full citations from Winchester's speech, the writer proceeds:

I cite as authority the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D. —
"The General Assembly is a purely delegated body; possessing powers limited and strictly defined. Intended to serve purposes plainly declared and capable of being destroyed without infringing upon one single principle of real Presbyterianism. It is created by the Presbyteries, a certain proportion of which may consist of laymen, and laymen, as well as clerical. We have appealed to the Presidents and Synods as the creators and advisers, under our Constitution, of this Assembly, who sat in claim for it omnipotent power to do what it pleased."

(*Presbyterian*, December 4, 1831.)

Still more to the purpose, because denouncing the mischievous interpretation put upon a certain clause of our Constitution by the majority of 1866, as by that of 1831, is the following extract from a protest signed by about forty of the Old School members of the Assembly of 1831: —
"We are greatly grieved by the action of this body, and grieved still more by the above decision, when and which the appellants rest their plea, that the duty of superintending the concerns of the whole Church" (*Form of Government*, xii. 5) invests the Assembly with all powers necessary to accomplish that object, at least, necessary, *tempore*, to establish the constitutional rights of Presbyteries, *et cetera*. Church sessions; to confound and contravene those original and essential principles of ecclesiastical government and order which constitute and characterize the Presbyterian Church."

Those who listened to the debates at St. Louis last May, will readily recall the use which was made of the sweeping clause of the Constitution quoted above; and how italys was employed to subvert the rights of individuals and Presbyteries. History is perpetually repeating itself.

If further testimony be needed as to the true doctrine of our Church respecting the powers of the General Assembly, it is supplied to our hand by the "Act and Testimony." Among the grave violations of "Church order" specified in this celebrated paper, we read as follows:

"We are greatly grieved by the action of the General Assembly of '66, that power was not clearly delegated to it, and that since even its delegating powers were parsimonious in comparison with its creation."

That this was the doctrine not only of the extreme right of the Old School party, but of the other wing also, can be shown by two or three quotations from the *Biblical Repository*. In that quarterly for January 1832, may be found an article from the pen of the late venerable Dr. Alexander, which attracted great attention at the time. It is nothing less than a plan for the entire reorganization of our judicaries. Its design, as stated by the writer, is "to show that the present organization of the Presbyterian Church in these United States is not essential, but that if many respects there might be a new modelling of the body, without the least interference with the radical principles of Presbyterianism." The plan proposed is "to divide the Church into six Synods, each of which shall meet annually, and possess all the judicial and *suprême* powers which now belong to the General Assembly." The General Assembly to be no longer a High Court of Appeals; as it now is, nor a judicial body at all; but simply a board of union and arbitration, *ad concilium* to the whole church." These brief sentences make it evident enough that Dr. Alexander saw no such self-contained, autocratic power in our Constitution, as our late expositors have found there.

Again, says the *Repository* for July, (and the words are worthy to be written in gold):

"The Presbyteries are the true fountain of all ecclesiastical power. They are independent bodies, except where they have chosen to unite with other Presbyteries, and cede part of their jurisdiction. The original powers and rights of Presbyteries belong to them, and cannot be taken away; if they no longer exist, clear evidence of their having been knowingly and voluntarily relinquished must be produced. It had been argued that because the Church is one, there have to be joined with this Presbytery, others. This argument, however, is fallacious, because their union is by compact, and cannot be pressed beyond the terms of the compact. The Presbyteries and churches are one, for the purposes and to the extent declared in the Constitution, and no farther. To insist that the Church has no right to exercise its *suprême* and uncontrolled rights of the constituent parts of the body, is to sustain that the Church is consolidated and to establish a *concrete spiritual* *disposition*."

This passage occurs in a summary of the arguments adduced in the General Assembly in favour of the inherent right of a Presbytery to examine ministers knocking at its door for admission. It bears the express endorsement of Dr. Hodge, Dr. Miller, Mr. (Dr?) Elliot, Mr. Winchester, and others. It appears to have the sanction of the author of the article in the *Repository*—the more so, as he adds at the close of the review—"There is hardly a single principle affirmed by this Assembly, which has not from the beginning been current in the Presbyterian Church." In any event, the theory of our system here set forth so lucidly, and affirmed by the Assembly of '35, (an Assembly distinguished alike for its members and its ability), has not been successfully impugned by the advocates of the new constitution scheme. Should they succeed, in revolutionizing our system, it will not be a mere handful of men who, sooner or later, will seek for Christian liberty in some free field.

Reserving for a future number the further consideration of these principles, I close with a brief citation from the *Repository* for January of the same year (35):

"Let us not expect the General Assembly to transgress all constitutional principles, and to compromise against men suspected of holding erroneous opinions, over the heads of their Presbyteries, when these Presbyteries themselves, and perhaps the decided majority of Old School men, do not think it proper to set in the case.... It really seems to be forgotten by some that our Constitution declares that

"all process against a gospel minister shall be entered in the Presbytery of which he is a member."

No ingenuity can bring this passage into coalescence with the consolidation theory. And I shall show, before closing the discussion, that even the acts of '37 lend no support to the oppressive edicts of '66, in "prosecuting" Presbyteries, and "commencing process" against the Declaration and Testimony men.

A MINORITY MAN.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
How Matters Ecclesiastical are Managed
In Baltimore.

The Presbytery of Baltimore, which has held its Fall meeting, and whose proceedings you have received, failed in two important particulars, to meet the exigencies of the important crisis now upon the church.

During the Summer two of the most influential churches and pastors in the city of Baltimore, withdrew from the organization represented by the Assembly, which met at St. Louis in May last. Four public meetings were held, where addresses were made to the people. At two of these the course of the General Assembly North, for the past six years, was denounced as being repugnant to the scriptures, and of course to the Standards of the church. On the basis of this opinion, separation from this body was determined, until it should return to its proper sphere, and renew its allegiance to the truth departed from. At a meeting held in the First Church, and addressed by Dr. Backus, this gentleman was generally understood to take the position, that the General Assembly had erred, but that neither its mere deliverances, nor its orders of 1865, bound his conscience, nor controled his action; and accordingly he had proceeded as a ruler in God's house irrespective of their existence. At a meeting held in the Central Church to correct misapprehensions existing in the community respecting the action of the General Assembly, Joseph T. Smith, D. D., a delegate to the Assembly of 1866, Drs. Backus and Dixon being in the pulpit, announced to the Presbyteries of Baltimore, and by the extensive dissemination of his address, to the church at large, that the orders of '65 were a "dead letter," and, if the Assemblies from '61 to '66 had done wrong, they had sinned in company with the whole church of God during the entire Christian era.

The whole scope of these addresses was to show that there was no cause for withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. In doing this, Dr. Backus declared that he ignored the orders of '65, because they were improper; and Dr. Smith declared he ignored them, because they were dead; Dr. Smith's address was circulated through the Assembly's Churches in the city, was not controverted by the Assembly's men here, and seems to have met from that party in Baltimore, general approval. It seems to have been semi-official. He seems to have spoken as a representative man; and the speech was regarded as a proper defense of those who, in the subsequent language of the Presbytery of Baltimore, "unqualifiedly adhere to the Assembly."

Now, these public addresses to a particular congregation in one instance, and to the Presbyterians in the city in the other, were, if they had any meaning whatever, for advice and instruction. Being from God's ministers, they purport to be consistent with what these gentlemen understand to be contained in the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Church.

With these documents in his hand, Dr. Backus declares the acts of '65 (the logical sequence of previous deliverances) to be wrong. Dr. Smith does not trouble himself as to whether they are right or wrong—but solemnly announces they are dead.

Now, the Assembly of '66 re-affirmed in their authority, all previous political acts of the past five Assemblies. They took back nothing, they rescinded nothing, they dead-lettered nothing. The author of the act of '65, and the Moderator and the representative man of Assembly of '66, repudiate the idea advanced by Dr. Smith, and shows he was misleading the people when he advanced it. In this view he is sustained by the men who lead the "advanced thought" of the church; and the next Assembly will show him, and those who have adopted his theory, that it is as baseless as the fabric of a vision.

Here then in Baltimore is great public excitement, and grave doubts existing among the people. In the emergency, two pastors withdraw from the Assembly's jurisdiction, and in so doing, and in stating their reasons for their individual conduct, by precept and example teach the people to follow them. Another pastor, stating the case in plain terms, stands in his place in connection with this body, and yet proclaims that it has erred, and refuses to execute its orders; and shows wherein he has neglected, and that purposely and consciously

to heed them. Another pastor shows that the trouble is much ado about nothing, as the church in like times has always acted in like manner, and the obnoxious orders are dead.

What is the action of the Baltimore Presbytery, whose duty it is "to preserve soundness of doctrine, and regularity of discipline," in view of the action of the Assembly of '66; especially the Pastoral Letter, which re-affirms the political action of the past? What is the action of the Presbytery in view of the causes of the division, by which they have lost two of their best churches and best men? What their action upon the report of their Commissioners to the Assembly, Messrs. Smith and Carter, and two elders who were sent each on his own responsibility, to consult, vote and determine on all things that may come before that body, according to the principles and constitution of this church and the word of God. And of his diligence herein, he is to render an account at his return? All that was done, was achieved on the 2d day of July last, at an adjourned meeting in a preamble, followed by a resolution to appoint a committee of five to wait on Messrs. Bullock and Lefevre. The action was not taken in view of the Assembly's deliverances, but in view of the action of Messrs. Bullock and Lefevre. It is stated in the third preamble: "Whereas this Presbytery, while it does unqualifiedly adhere to the General Assembly, has erred, but that neither its mere deliverances, nor its orders of 1865, bind his conscience, nor controled his action; and accordingly he had proceeded as a ruler in God's house irrespective of their existence. At a meeting held in the Central Church to correct misapprehensions existing in the community respecting the action of the General Assembly, Joseph T. Smith, D. D., a delegate to the Assembly of 1866, Drs. Backus and Dixon being in the pulpit, announced to the Presbyteries of Baltimore, and by the extensive dissemination of his address, to the church at large, that the orders of '65 were a "dead letter," and, if the Assemblies from '61 to '66 had done wrong, they had sinned in company with the whole church of God during the entire Christian era.

The whole scope of these addresses was to show that there was no cause for withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. In doing this, Dr. Backus declared that he ignored the orders of '65, because they were improper; and Dr. Smith declared he ignored them, because they were dead; Dr. Smith's address was circulated through the Assembly's Churches in the city, was not controverted by the Assembly's men here, and seems to have met from that party in Baltimore, general approval. It seems to have been semi-official. He seems to have spoken as a representative man; and the speech was regarded as a proper defense of those who, in the subsequent language of the Presbytery of Baltimore, "unqualifiedly adhere to the Assembly."

Now, these public addresses to a particular congregation in one instance, and to the Presbyterians in the city in the other, were, if they had any meaning whatever, for advice and instruction. Being from God's ministers, they purport to be consistent with what these gentlemen understand to be contained in the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Church.

With these documents in his hand, Dr. Backus declares the acts of '65 (the logical sequence of previous deliverances) to be wrong. Dr. Smith does not trouble himself as to whether they are right or wrong—but solemnly announces they are dead.

Now, the Assembly of '66 re-affirmed in their authority, all previous political acts of the past five Assemblies. They took back nothing, they rescinded nothing, they dead-lettered nothing. The author of the act of '65, and the Moderator and the representative man of Assembly of '66, repudiate the idea advanced by Dr. Smith, and shows he was misleading the people when he advanced it. In this view he is sustained by the men who lead the "advanced thought" of the church; and the next Assembly will show him, and those who have adopted his theory, that it is as baseless as the fabric of a vision.

Here then in Baltimore is great public excitement, and grave doubts existing among the people. In the emergency, two pastors withdraw from the Assembly's jurisdiction, and in so doing, and in stating their reasons for their individual conduct, by precept and example teach the people to follow them. Another pastor, stating the case in plain terms, stands in his place in connection with this body, and yet proclaims that it has erred, and refuses to execute its orders; and shows wherein he has neglected, and that purposely and consciously

to heed them. Another pastor shows that the trouble is much ado about nothing, as the church in like times has always acted in like manner, and the obnoxious orders are dead.

What is the action of the Baltimore Presbytery—i. e., nothing. In conclusion, I have only to say, that he who like Lord Burleigh, is reputed to look wiser than man ever was, had his notorious amendment put on the docket, where it remains unnoticed until this day; and that an endeavor to bring the New School union to the notice of the body was defeated by vote, it would seem on the ground that the measure of reunion was before a joint committee, and the committee ought to report undisturbed by extraneous intrusion, such as the opinion of a court of Christ, upon the terms of the contract. Here are two obscure points of law to be decided. The Pastors and Elders of a Church quarrel. The Presbytery requests them to settle the dispute between them, if they can. They fail. The case comes up, not by reference, not by appeal, not by complaint, not in any way of original process for trial of any one—but comes up because the parties to the dispute cannot agree to any terms, as Presbytery, at a past meeting, hoped. The Presbytery determines to hear the Pastor, to hear Elders *sororitatis*; to hear the Pastor again, and then to hear one Elder. After this process is finished, the Pastor asks the pastoral relation to be dissolved. The Elders agree to this, and the thing is done; and the next morning the Presbytery sends a note of excuse to the people of the church, and an apology to Synod, for not proceeding according to the book, stating as a reason, the mind of Presbytery, that the connection between the Pastor and Church could not with edification be sustained, and it had better be broken at once, without waiting to know officially the mind of the people by citation, and other routine forms usual in such cases. The Assembly reaches its hand over Synod's; can a Presbytery reach its hand over the constitution whenever it judges it expedient so to do? Is this a cause of substantial right done without the use of forms?

The 2d problem is: Can a man, an Elder in a church where Session has refused to send an Elder to represent them, be admitted as a delegate? In other words, is appointment or election on part of the Session, an indispensable requisite to a seat in Presbytery in the case of Elders? The Presbytery of Baltimore says yes; and claims the right to admit to the vacant place, the first Elder from that church which omits to send a delegate, who presents himself; and of course, if several should appear to elect the one who states. Does not every court of Christ possess the prerogatives of any other court? If the General Assembly can do the peculiar work of the lower courts, why may not Synod do the work of Presbytery, and Presbytery of the Session!! So far as the Elders are concerned, according to usage, the Presbytery is a delegated body, since all the Elders of every church court, and ought not to sit in the body. But can a delegated body, having this character, in whole or in part, create or destroy its own constituents? It is wrong for a Session to neglect or refuse to send Elders to the higher courts, with which it is in connection; but is the power to create a delegate thereby, *ipso facto*, lodged in the hands of the Presbytery. This is not the way to remedy the evil. There is another and the true method.

I mention these cases to show where men receive the training and hardihood for those daring and scandalous measures, which of late have startled us so often in the highest court of the church.

OBSERVER.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
The Right of Private Judgment—Breckinridge vs. Humphrey.

We adopted the threefold division of questions—those wholly spiritual, those wholly temporal, and those mixed, participating of both (Subj. Theol. page 322); and hope that since he has followed Dr. B. in a doubtful question, he will see his way clear to adopt that about which there can be no doubt, so that when he next states the case he will give the latter its due weight and consideration.

Dr. B. writes thus: "whence it follows, in the first place, that the sanctions of spiritual authority must be exclusively spiritual; and in the second place, that they must have outward force exclusively upon those who voluntarily submit themselves to them. Their validity depends absolutely upon their ratification by Jesus Christ, the only Lawgiver, Ruler and Judge of the Church; and that ratification will, except in cases of miraculous interposition by him, be openly declared in the day of judgment. The result therefore, is this: Synods and Councils, lawfully constituted in the name and by the authority of the glorified Redeemer, may, with divine authority and the peril of their souls, *excommunicate* and *banish* any member of the church, if they are false, or refuse to obey them if they are false, on the peril of his soul; and whether they be true or false, must be determined according to the Word and Spirit of God, by each child of God, for himself, at his own proper time. There is a government in the kingdom of God; but the kingdom itself is made up of those, all of whom are Kings and Priests; and the government over them is under Christ their Lord, and its acts are valid only with the word and through the Spirit of God."

Again: "And, doubtless, decrees and decisions concerning the truth and concerning controversies are proper to all Councils, Assemblies, Synods, and other lawful authorities in the Church &c. And these decrees and decisions, if consonant to the word of God are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word of God, but also for the power whereby they are made as being an ordinance of God appointed thereto in his word." And in general the presumption—before any particular inquiry—is that all such decrees and decisions of the true Church are consonant to the truth of God; but since the visible Church is not God; but that the visible Church—that presumption may be false; nor is it possible for any decree or decision of a fallible church to bind the conscience by their own power. In this way and to this extent only the Church visible is the judge of controversies concerning that pure faith which is her own fundamental mark. She must keep the unity of the Spirit—she must keep herself pure—and in the love of God.

(K. of G. Subj. Cons. pp. 323-350.)

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
Presbytery of Muhlenburg.

The Presbytery of Muhlenburg met Oct. 6th, at Ridgewood Church, in Henderson county, Ky. Rev. R. K. Smoot, the Moderator, preached the opening sermon from Acts xx: 28. The Stated Clerk, Rev. S. Y. Garrison, was absent, and Rev. J. Woodbridge was designated Temporary Clerk, and proceeded to call the roll of ministers from the printed minutes of the General Assembly. All the ministers were present except four, Rev. A. C. Dickerson, Rev. S. Y. Garrison, Rev. A. D. Metcalfe, Rev. H. V. D. Nevius. Elders were present from a large number of the churches.

When Rev. Alex. Rankin's name was called, he arose and addressed Mr. Smoot in these words: "I cannot answer to my name. I do not consider that this the Muhlenburg Presbytery, because you have on your roll the name of a Declaration and Testimony man, and one is on the ground. I consider the action of the General Assembly severe and unwise, but I will obey its orders, and so cannot consider this the Presbytery. There being no other ministers here to organize the Muhlenburg Presbytery with me, I must consider this the Muhlenburg Presbytery, because the church is still bound to an obedience to the law, and not to the unfaithful agent of that law. In the present case the violation of engagement is in the Assembly, which has set at naught the authority of the constitution, and not in those who adhere to it with unbroken faith. But it is demanded, 'Has an individual a right to interpret the constitution in opposition to the law?' We answer, every man living under that constitution, and every Presbytery and Synod has a right to judge whether the temporary or delegated body which composes the Assembly, interprets the law according to its obvious import, and when it is made clear that the supreme law has been infringed it is their duty and right to resist. How can a man pledge his obedience which he is unable to fulfil? To transfer the constitution of engagement to another body which does not recognize it is to commit treason. We are aware that this resistance may be stigmatized as insurrection, but it may be more correctly denominated a *sacred defiance of our ecclesiastical charter*."

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.

Presbyterian Church expressly demands (confession of Faith, chap. 31, sec. 4) that "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and also (form of government, chap. 1, sec. 7) "that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority, and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God."

Whereas, Successive General Assemblies from 1861 to 1865 have assumed the right to decide ecclesiastical strictly civil political in their nature, involving the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States in the relation of the States to the Federal Government, and the proper policy to be pursued by the Federal Government, and the duty of the members of the church in regard to the civil policy they should support in their capacity as citizens of the United States, upon which questions the word of God gives no instructions whatever; and

Whereas, The General Assembly of 1865 issued injunctions to all the Presbyteries and Church Sessions under its care to enforce the adoption of the opinions contained in these political deliverances as a term of ministerial communion and church membership in regard to persons coming from churches in the Southern States; thus legislating where Christ has not legislated, and making terms of

communion which He has not made, exercising a spirit of partiality, and throwing insuperable barriers in the way of reunion and peace in the church; and

Whereas The Assembly of 1866

Free Christian Commonwealth

Rev. STUART ROBINSON, Editor.
A. DAVIDSON & Co., Publishers.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1866.

The new position of conservative men in the Border States and Northern Churches, and their corresponding duties.

The division which the new-born zeal for ecclesiastical authority has forced upon the Churches in Kentucky and Missouri puts a somewhat different face upon the controversy between the friends of Christian freedom and the advocates of arbitrary ecclesiastical power. It may be important just now to consider carefully what points have been settled by this division, and what duties it devolves upon the friends of the truth everywhere.

It is now very manifest that the reasons which Radicalism has heretofore been assigning in justification of its arbitrary and high-handed decrees, dissolving Presbyteries *ipso facto*, and citing *gangs* of men to its bar for trial by the *gang*, are not the real but only pretended reasons.

That the dissolution of these Presbyteries has not been—as at first pretended in the Assembly—in consequence of the horror of pious Radicalism at Wilson and Robinson as the chief of sinners, is manifest enough from the infliction of the sentence by the Assembly's faithful hangmen in Transylvania Presbytery upon Messrs. Barnes and Saunders—men void of offence perhaps beyond all other men of our Synod.

Nor was there the fierce vituperative spirit of the Declaration and Testimony the cause of dissolving; since the singularly moderate and good-tempered protest of the Lexington address seems to have excited just as much wrath among the Assembly's adherents, and to have been made just as much a ground of dissension as the Declaration and Testimony.

Nor was the real cause of the dissolution the signing of that paper; as is manifest from the fact that West Lexington and other Presbyteries were dissolved though no signers of the declaration were present in them.

Nor has the division resulted from our reckless purpose to divide the Churches, as charged upon the witnesses for the truth; as is manifest from the rejection of all our overtures for peace by the Assembly's adherents in Louisville Presbytery; and still more manifest from the course of the adherents of the Assembly in the Synod of Missouri, when their opponents desired to postpone division by adjournment for a whole year.

And that there was some other motive for pressing this division in the two Synods than simple obedience to the order of Assembly, is manifest enough from the fact that the order of the Assembly did not require the *ipso facto* dissolution of the Synods. Nor, as we have the best reason for believing, did Dr. Gurley, the author of the Assembly's decree, himself understand it to operate the *ipso facto* dissolution of the Synods, but the contrary. The dissolution of the Synods was, therefore, in excess of the Assembly's order.

What then was the real motive and purpose of the Assembly's adherents in the Border States, in pressing so recklessly the execution of the Assembly's order—even beyond the requirements of the Assembly itself? We answer, very manifestly, the same purpose and motive which has actuated the leaders of the Assembly in their orders of 1865 and 1866, and in the whole of their hostility to the signers of the Declaration and Testimony, viz.: The purpose to get out of their way every man who will not concur with them in their design to make the Presbyterian Church the handmaid of a certain Puritanico-political party, now in the ascendancy in the country. The man who will quietly acquiesce in this semi-erastianism, and accept Thaddeus Stevens and Sumner as his political apostles, may sign as many Declarations, Testimonies and protests as he pleases without offence. The man who will not must be anathematized and ostracized, even though his testimony be as meekly as the Lexington address, and his reputation for the moderation and amiableness of his spirit be that of Messrs. Barnes and Saunders. Mr. Brock to day is just as thoroughly hated, and is maligned with just as much gusto, as Mr. Robinson; Dr. VanDyke as Dr. Wilson; Dr. Boardman even more than Dr. Brookes.

It is something gained to the cause of truth to have thus cleared away the false issues and exposed the shallow pretenses of the adherents of the Assembly. It is a still larger gain to have reached the point where worldly discussion and ecclesiastical struggles for numbers must change into vigorous action for the support and propagation of the great truths now already seen to be involved in this controversy. And if the friends of truth will now cast away from them all side issues, and devote themselves assiduously to the work of maintaining the principles for which they contend by a vigorous support of those who teach these principles against the avowed purpose of the

American men to crush them out by means of the power and money of its Beard, it will not be long before they will see the triumph of their testimony.

The Synod of Kentucky by its prompt and vigorous movement for organizing a Committee of Missions with \$20,000 at its command for missionary and substantial purposes, has shown a full appreciation of the new position. If the Synod of Missouri shall succeed in giving an equal degree of efficiency to its Committee of Missions, organized a year ago, there need no longer be any fear among the hard working Missionaries who concur in our testimony of being driven out of the field; nor any temptation to our feeble congregations to accept the seductive bribes offered by the emissaries of the Philadelphia Board. With \$10,000 at the command of the two Synods—more than half the amount raised for the Philadelphia Board last year—we should be able not only "to strengthen our stakes," but "to strengthen our cords" also.

In the suffering districts of the Southern States, there are ministers and congregations holding "the like precious faith with us," whom we ought to assist in their distress. In the States North of us, where the policy of the Protestant Church Courts has driven nearly one half the people out of connection with Protestantism into either Popery or infidelity—there are many communities where missionaries from the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri could get the ear of the people and save many of them yet to the cause of Protestantism. And we doubt not that, with proper effort among the people, an adequate support could be obtained in many such neighborhoods for ministers known to be the preachers of a non-political gospel.

The appeal has come to us from many quarters in the North—"What shall we do? You in the Border States have ecclesiastical organizations and can go forward; but we are scattered bodies of people, with few ministers to lead us—and the ecclesiastical organizations against us." We take the liberty of answering—though only on our own personal responsibility—"You can do much if you have but the faith and courage to go forward. Organize yourselves for public worship—let the world around you see that you are still Presbyterians who stand fast by our ancient principles of Christ's Crown and Covenant—obtain the services of some minister who sympathizes with your views to labor among you. If you need assistance, apply to your friends in the Border States. Do not stand on questions of ecclesiastical etiquette, while you see whole communities around you driven away from the Protestant churches, because they will not act with a particular political party. A half dozen earnest Christian men and women in any such position, can make themselves more efficient as witnesses for the truth, and more terrible to its adversaries, than any half dozen Doctors of Divinity with their ponderous ecclesiastical disquisitions. Get men around you engaged, with their families, in the worship of Jesus, the King in Zion, and leave the question of ecclesiastical relations and forms to be settled when you get farther on, and when the Lord shall restore his church from her apostasies. Ecclesiastical relations and forms of government are very important; but the gospel preached to perishing sinners around you, is still more important. Ecclesiastical disorder is an evil—but allowing whole families and neighborhoods to be driven off from the gospel, is still a greater evil.

We cannot express too strongly the conviction that the time has now come that, whether it be from the defect of our old-fashioned conservatism or from the overstrained views of this dashing Rhetorician, we cannot accept several of the propositions that enter into his view of the *rationale* of preaching, while we fully concur in his views of the failure of the methods, heretofore popular to bring the gospel before the masses and fasten their attention upon it, our judgment is that the failure arises in large part from the false theories of preaching under which young preachers are trained, rather than from any change in the spirit of the times; and that the very supposition of this writer that the gospel can be accommodated to the spirit of the times, argues that he has not yet himself gotten to the bottom of the difficulty which he proposes to remedy.

Preaching, as we understand it, may imply eloquent speech, and learned exposition of a book, and effort to elevate and save souls. But these are not all of it, nor the essential elements of it. To preach the Word in our times, or in any times, is to take the Word as spoken "at sundry times and in divers manners" by Jesus the Prophet of the Church and translate it into the forms of thought and speech current in these times. The preacher stands before men to speak by authority, in the name of Christ. And so far from seeking to flatter the wrong passions of the times, he is to endeavor to impress the men of the times with the notion that he speaks by authority and "not as the scribes" of the platform and the lectorium. The book that he expounds, moreover is not of Cicero or

Socrates who spoke words of wisdom, but of Jesus who speaks in this Word to the souls of men here and now.

It must be borne in mind that Paul and the other first preachers of our gospel, troubled themselves very little about conforming to the advanced thought of their times. Nay they expressly declared that, of set purpose they would not gratify the taste of the times. Earnest as they were for the salvation of their kindred according to the flesh and of the Gentiles still they could not conform the gospel to their tastes. Though "to the Jew a stumbling block and to the Greek foolishness," still they must preach Christ crucified, and nothing else.

We are sorry to find this writer, after so clearly setting forth the theory of the three divine ordinances of the family, the Church and the State, falling in with the current hue and cry against the ultraism of preachers who refuse to use their position as a means for inculcating a political policy on the people; and resting content with the foggy-headed platitudes of the American Erastianism, concerning the obligation to extend the sphere of the preacher into the domain of civil affairs; for he seems to speak approvingly even of Beecher's political deliverances from the pulpit. When will men learn the simple truth, that as God has ordained the State, and has commissioned the Magistrate, so He has given to the State and the Magistrate a rule of faith and action, separate and apart from the revealed rule of faith which He has given to His Church. And that this great rule of faith to the nation is binding alike upon all nations Christian, Mahomedan or Pagan, without distinction; and He has no more committed the interpretation of this rule to the ministers of His gospel than He has committed to them the power of the sword? That even without the light of the gospel revelation, men are perfectly capable of interpreting and applying the rule of natural law which God has given to the nation.

Such writers as this in the *Reportory* are the men of all others to know that, as matter of fact, men without the gospel have expounded and applied the law of God to civil society fully as well as those who have the gospel. The "Offices of Cicero," or his letter to his brother on the duties of a Governor of a province, if carefully studied, might well cause both the ecclesiastics and jurists who have ruled over our country for six years past, to blush for their mal-administration. The heathen Cicero's Offices to-day is a better exposition of the duties of a man in civil society, than—*the Second Treatise of Civil Government* of John Locke in the United States on the same subject for five years past. And yet men will insist on preaching Socrates as well as Christ, Cicero as well as Paul—Plato as well as John, under the fallacious plea that the gospel must take cognizance of all wrong doing.

This subject of preaching for the times seems to be attracting attention in Britain as well as in America. We notice in the *North British Review* for September, an elaborate article on the English pulpit historically considered, at the close of which the writer presents his views also of the changes which the times call for in the pulpit.

We are painfully impressed from this article as well as from numerous other unmistakable signs that bad as is the notion of preaching in our own church in the United States, it is yet greatly above the Free Church of Scotland, which we are accustomed to regard as the most evangelical and orthodox of the British Churches. The conception of "preaching the word" as a Divinely appointed office for calling sinners and edifying them; of speaking the word simply as God's message to men, though it seem the "foolishness" preaching seems to be rapidly dropping out of the consciousness of the Churches of Scotland. Preaching seems to be treated as a profession, an art, a bidding for the popular favor. This writer advocates the English plan of preaching class, as distinct from the class of ministers, after the fashion of the middle ages. He favors the English plan of preaching borrowed sermons, as better than any that a busy pastor can prepare. He sneers at the preaching which seeks to "edify." In short he seems utterly oblivious of the gospel theory of preaching as speaking for God to men.

The Old Story—"If the next Assembly does not &c.—Then!"

We had supposed that after forcing the ploughshare through the Kentucky churches, and proceeding as volunteer hangmen for the General Assembly, we would at last, after six years of "wait—wait, see what the Assembly will do"—we are as much averse to the Assembly's unconstitutional and outrageous acts as any of you; if they are not taken back, then"—etc.—would now be treated to a new song. But to our amazement we hear of celestial brethren who, to keep the consciences of conservative people quiet, are still assuring them, that resistance shall yet be made to the General Assembly—and all in Kentucky will yet stand together. King James called Presbyterians "the Lord's silly sheep." We answer in the *affirmative* to all these questions. The Secretaries of the Boards of the Church are without congregational charge; but are editors of religious newspapers; but they sit and vote in the Presbyteries, and they are competent to represent the Presbyteries to which they belong in the General Assembly.

A somewhat dogmatical Answer.

The *Presbyterian* of October 27, states a question from a Baltimore correspondent, with the editor's answer as follows:

"ANSWER.—A correspondent in Baltimore asks the following questions:

"Can persons who have been ordained, but without congregational charge, be members of Presbyteries? Can they sit and vote? Can they, or ought they, be competent to represent a Presbytery in the General Assembly?"

"We answer in the *affirmative* to all these questions. The Secretaries of the Boards of the Church are without congregational charge; but are editors of religious newspapers; but they sit and vote in the Presbyteries, and they are competent to represent the Presbyteries to which they belong in the General Assembly."

to accept the royal definition, if this last and most preposterous of insults to the intelligence of Presbyterian people shall be quietly pocketed.

What matters it now as to *future* action of the Assembly? How can that affect the question of the relations between the executioners and the executed in Kentucky? How can that heal the sense of outrage, meanness and treachery? How can that restore confidence and harmony between the injurers and the injured?

A Reliable Correspondent.

The *Presbyterian*'s letter writer, on the subject of the division of the Missouri Synod, mentions among other grounds of hope entertained by his radical friends, the following:

"It was known that Drs. Robinson and Wilson, of Kentucky, had written, signifying their purpose to go with the Southern Assembly; a few of the Declaration of Independence in Missouri were of like mind; but the majority of them were opposed to any such movement."

How it was known that Drs. Robinson and Wilson had written, signifying their purpose to go with the Southern Assembly, is a mystery to those gentlemen—and particularly to Dr. Wilson, who had every reason to suppose it was known very generally that he had no such purpose, having with his church declared the contrary officially and formally.

The Radical logicians and historians have a wonderful way of having "it known" impersonally, just as the conveniences of the argument for the time being requires. Hence, the preposterous history-making which precedes most of their arguments. Let them make a premise of fact to suit and they can make a show of argument.

The Boy-Moderator and the Venerable Stated Clerk.

The *Presbyterian's* reliable correspondent at Lexington, Ky., furnished that journal with an inside view of the proceedings of Synod at Henderson, in which occurs the following sentence:

"After prayer, the venerable Stated Clerk, the Rev. S. McRoberts, who had been just twenty-five years in the office, began to call the roll, commencing with the Presbytery of Louisville. The men on the roll then elected a Stated Clerk, the Rev. F. G. Strahan, and a boy Moderator, the Rev. R. Douglass and a Temporary Clerk, the Rev. Robert Morrison, a signer of the Declaration and Testimony, and adjourned.

This writer seems to forget, as does his bogus Synod also in re-instituting Mr. McRoberts, that they are setting at defiance the judgment of the General Assembly, or at least what will be its judgment when the report of its committee on the records of the Synod of Kentucky shall come to be acted upon by the next Assembly, to which this report was referred for want of time. Does not this writer know that the committee on our records in the last Assembly, reported to that body in substance that our minutes had been disgracefully kept, and that the Synod of Kentucky had the *Office of Cicero*, or his letter to his brother on the duties of a Governor of a province, if carefully studied, might well cause both the ecclesiastics and jurists who have ruled over our country for six years past, to blush for their mal-administration. The heathen Cicero's Offices to-day is a better exposition of the duties of a man in civil society, than—*the Second Treatise of Civil Government* of John Locke in the United States on the same subject for five years past. And yet men will insist on preaching Socrates as well as Christ, Cicero as well as Paul—Plato as well as John, under the fallacious plea that the gospel must take cognizance of all wrong doing.

This subject of preaching for the times seems to be attracting attention in Britain as well as in America. We notice in the *North British Review* for September, an elaborate article on the English pulpit historically considered, at the close of which the writer presents his views also of the changes which the times call for in the pulpit.

We are painfully impressed from this article as well as from numerous other unmistakable signs that bad as is the notion of preaching in our own church in the United States, it is yet greatly above the Free Church of Scotland, which we are accustomed to regard as the most evangelical and orthodox of the British Churches. The conception of "preaching the word" as a Divinely appointed office for calling sinners and edifying them; of speaking the word simply as God's message to men, though it seem the "foolishness" preaching seems to be rapidly dropping out of the consciousness of the Churches of Scotland. Preaching seems to be treated as a profession, an art, a bidding for the popular favor. This writer advocates the English plan of preaching class, as distinct from the class of ministers, after the fashion of the middle ages. He favors the English plan of preaching borrowed sermons, as better than any that a busy pastor can prepare. He sneers at the preaching which seeks to "edify." In short he seems utterly oblivious of the gospel theory of preaching as speaking for God to men.

The Old Story—"If the next Assembly does not &c.—Then!"

We had supposed that after forcing the ploughshare through the Kentucky churches, and proceeding as volunteer hangmen for the General Assembly, we would at last, after six years of "wait—wait, see what the Assembly will do"—we are as much averse to the Assembly's unconstitutional and outrageous acts as any of you; if they are not taken back, then"—etc.—would now be treated to a new song. But to our amazement we hear of celestial brethren who, to keep the consciences of conservative people quiet, are still assuring them, that resistance shall yet be made to the General Assembly—and all in Kentucky will yet stand together. King James called Presbyterians "the Lord's silly sheep." We answer in the *affirmative* to all these questions. The Secretaries of the Boards of the Church are without congregational charge; but are editors of religious newspapers; but they sit and vote in the Presbyteries, and they are competent to represent the Presbyteries to which they belong in the General Assembly.

Especialy does it seem to us in accordance with the eternal fitness of things" that such a Synod should have just such a Moderator as Mr. Lapsley, and just such clerks as Mr. Allen and Mr. McRoberts, neither of the the three doing the proper work of the ministry. Besides, Mr. Douglass is a laborious and successful pastor, while Mr. Lapsley is we believe a store keeper in a small way. It is difficult to conceive where else could have been found the marvellous combination of the maximum of unconscious effrontery, and conscious cunning, with the minimum of brains, courage and delicacy of feeling which so truly typifies the nature of the work which this Synod is set up to accomplish in Kentucky. We are content to be represented by the "Boy-Moderator," and we shall certainly feel constrained

Ground of the Action of 1837.

The very able correspondent of the *Presbyterian* who signs himself a "Minority Man," and who is evidently posted touching the Old and New School controversy, gives the following account of the grounds of the action of 1837, by way of exposing the fallacies of those who cite the men of '37 in support of the acts of 1836-6:

As a counterpoise to the authorities adduced in support of the true theory of our system, our consolidation between point to certain of the acts of the Assembly of 1837. On these alleged precedents the following observations are submitted.

The formal deliberate exposition of the Constitution on the part of the General Assembly, and of all who adhered to it, cannot be invalidated by the subsequent acts of the body. Different Assemblies reaffirmed the doctrine, including that of 1837, that the powers entrusted to our supreme judiciary are delegated, specific and limited; and that it has no warrant to assume at will the rights and functions of the inferior courts. If this doctrine was sometimes contravened in the course of our New School controversy, an explanation may be found in the circumstances of the times. The good men who shaped the policy of the Church in those days were neither better nor worse than good men usually are in kindred circumstances. When they were in a minority, as in the Assemblies of '34 and '36, they insisted upon the literal and established interpretation of the Constitution. There were no temptations to adopt any other view, they held that "the power of the whole is not over every part, but over the power of each part." When they were in a majority, as in '35 and '37, and still affirming in express terms (*Vide Nos. I. and II. of this series*) the true theory of our system, they found a supposed warrant for the high prerogative doctrine in the clauses of the Constitution conferring upon the General Assembly a "superintendence over the concerns of the whole church," and "the power of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations." They did indeed argue that the vigorous measures of '37 were no way incompatible with their well-known doctrines of constitutional law. But there were two other grounds upon which they rested the validity of those measures, and which future historians will be likely to regard as supplying the *chiric* if not their exclusive justification. The first was the admitted unconstitutionality of the Plan of Union, in virtue of which on its adoption, the Synods built upon it fell with it. This principle was recognized and affirmed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

The other ground was, the *necessity of the case*. This finding more or less directly pervades the entire proceedings of the Ohio School party. A crisis was upon them. The exigencies of the church demanded extreme measures. If they failed now to secure a permanent ascendancy in its councils, the golden opportunity would be lost, and danger threatened to see the church pass finally into the hands of a party hostile to its faith and order, and alien from all its traditions. "There are difficulties connected with the plan," said Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, in the debate upon citing inferior judicatories, "but the best course is the shortest one. You should go right onward and directly to the cure of the present evils. The church is tired of controversy, and longs for peace. We maintain the standards and the power we now have to preserve them we may never have again. Two years ago the orthodoxy had the majority, and if they had properly used it, not only would much subsequent contention have been avoided, but the church would have approved your course. Now is our time. We must reform, or be dissolved. To live together is impossible. We should, therefore, say to the opposing party, 'Gentlemen, there is the door, the highway is yours.' And if they will not go, we should kindly, but firmly help them out."

This was the prevalent feeling. It indicates a period of mighty conflict and of revolution. I do not impugn either the motives or the measures of the party that engaged them. That it was guided by a strong sense of justice, and a profound sense of obligation to its Divine Head, is sufficiently apparent from the eminent names which grace the records of that Assembly. Concerning this "boy Moderator," considering that he has been pastor of one of our important churches for some seven years past, we imagine that Mr. Douglass must be of age at least. And considering the reputation that he has made for himself among his brethren as a man of thinking power of no mean order, of wisdom, prudence and great moderation, it is no wonder that he should have been selected at such a time to preside over the Synod, nor surprising that he discharged his duties to the satisfaction of all.

It had not occurred to us, until suggested by the remarks of this writer, how strikingly the great ideas of the two Presbyterians presented in the two Synods of Kentucky are typified in the men under which each Synod was organized, and is now officiating. To the popular ear in Kentucky how readily do the names of Breck, Douglass, Strahan, Morrison, suggest the notion of the calm, dignified and courteous, yet manly, candid, and courageous style of religion heretofore so characteristic of our people. While on the other hand the names of McKee, Lapsley, Allen, and McRoberts are daily becoming more and more suggestive of the canting, crafty, common-place, strategic, ecclesiastical which the new order of things is seeking to introduce among us.

Free Christian Commonwealth

IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEEK AT LOUISVILLE.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
For One Year, in advance, \$3.00
" " after Six Months, 35
ADVERTISEMENTS

Not inconsistent with the character of the paper, will be admitted on the following terms:

Per one square (ten lines) or less, one insertion, \$1.50
" " one month, 80
" " three months, 60
" " six months, 40
" " one year, 30

Advertisements exceeding one square, will be charged at a proportion reduction on the above rates.

All communications touching the paper, whether news or otherwise, addressed to

A. DAVIDSON & CO., Publishers,
No. 95, Third Street, Louisville, Ky.

OBITUARIES extending over ten (10) lines will be charged at the rate of 10¢ per line—eight words to the line.

Mr. Joseph V. Morton, of Shelbyville Ky., has kindly offered his services in behalf of the Free Christian Commonwealth, in Shelby Co. and he is hereby authorized to receive for any money paid to him for the paper. He will also receive the names of new subscribers and forward them to us. He will also receive orders for Dr. Robinson's new book, "Discourses of Redemption."

We hope our friends will not forget the fact—a fact which we are not allowed to forget—that printer's bills must be paid weekly. We would remind our subscribers that we are now publishing the 2d volume of the Free Christian Commonwealth, and hope they will remit the amount of subscription.

Baptism by Immersion under the Assembly's Authority.

We find the following in the Presbytery of October 27:

Large Additions—The Rev. T. G. Murphy, who is laboring in Amelia county, Va., for the Assembly's Committee of Freedmen, in a note to this office, says:

"On last Sabbath I received forty-one additional members into one of my churches. Of this number I baptized 32 yester evening. The church now numbers ninety-four members. In my two churches there are now one hundred and thirty members, forty-two of whom I immersed.

Neither Rev. Mr. Murphy nor the editor condones to explain the reason for this wholesale baptism by immersion, which the Westminster Assembly came within one vote of declaring to be no baptism at all. Every pastor of any experience knows that when the case arises of a convert wishing to be immersed, the desire arises from a total misapprehension of the nature and significance of the ordinance. And therefore the wise and conscientious pastor is unwilling to gain a member at the expense of officially endorsing grave

It will seem to us that such scruple should prevail, if at all in the case of the poor ignorant African. Surely the church cannot afford to let the mode of baptism be decided by such theologians.

But does not this latitudinarianism grow out of the instinctive feeling of all Northern men, that any thing in the way of religion is good enough for a negro? They are only negroes! Why not humor their superstitions? We doubt the efficiency of such a gospel for the negro as humors his superstitions.

Manly fraternal Tribute to Dr. E. D. McMaster.

In a very pleasant passage at arms with the New York Freeman's Journal, on the subject of Dr. Dabney's account of Stonewall Jackson's reception into the Presbyterian Church, we had occasion to say of Mr. McMaster the editor:

We do not even know precisely the degree of relationship between him and his distinguished namesake in the Presbyterian Church. When we say, however, that we have ever entertained the greatest respect for the Presbyterian Doctor McMaster, as a man of genius, a profound theologian, a bold, fearless, honest man, and a high gentleman—notwithstanding all his strange vagaries as an abolitionist, nobody who knows us will longer wonder that we should be able to entertain a like respect for the New York kinsman as a man of fine genius, manly courage, true honor and high principle, in spite of the fact that he has fallen into the errors of Rome. We can only regret that so glorious a cause as that in which his fore-fathers suffered, should have lost the services of a son who has shown so much of their indomitable manly spirit.

In his paper of October 27th, the editor concludes a sur-rejoinder, with the following paragraph, which as an old friend of Dr. E. D. McMaster, we take special pleasure in reproducing:

In regard to our personal history and relationships, we have already said more than was worth while. What kindred we are to Dr. E. D. McMaster, it would be for him, as considerably the older man, to acknowledge, or to disregard. As to "genius," Dr. Robinson may, or may not, be mistaken in him—as he certainly is, when he kindly attributes the same to us. That is a small matter, either way. But in regard to his unsurpassed honesty, and chivalrous honor, he has said none too much. Never was there a more unselfish and fearlessly true heart held, intellectually, in the bond of Calvinism. He would die sooner than do a thing his conscience condemned, or that was mean. We can assure Dr. Robinson, moreover, that he misjudges him, in speaking of his "vagaries as an abolitionist." In the political and offensive sense of that term, he never was an abolitionist. His early training, to which he has been but too literally faithful, would forbid it. Moreover we have the testimony, among our personal friends of several of the brightest men that were under his training, in their youth at Jefferson College, and at Miami University, and who hold with Dr. Robinson on the slavery question, that Dr. McMaster was no "abolitionist," in the bad and political meaning of the term. That he abhorred slavery, and wished the country rid of it, was true. The same was true, before the late war, of many slaveholders, of our own acquaint-

ance. But it was not in his nature to be a revolutionist, or to overturn the political fabric, for the sake of getting rid of one of its incidental evils. Nor would he work by sinister and conspiratorial means, to do underhand, what he had not the legal right to do openly. Therefore, except as Washington and Jefferson were "abolitionists"—as wishing it were done away with—he was no "abolitionist."

The Synod of Philadelphia Whipped In.

It will be remembered that the action of the Synod of Philadelphia last year, pronouncing the Doctrine Loyalty and Freedom orders not obligatory as constitutional rules, was cited very freely as an encouragement to "wait," "wait," and conservative men at the North would go with us. But as usual, the men that waited to be hand-edged showed any other than a fighting propensity after that processus is completed. We are not surprised, therefore, to meet with the following announcement:

"The Synod of Philadelphia met at Easton, Pennsylvania, last week. The following resolution was adopted by a vote of \$2 to 29:

Resolved, That in the action of the General Assembly at St. Louis in the case of the Louisville Presbytery, and the

signers of the Declaration and Testimony, this Synod recognizes an honest and enlightened zeal for the purity of our beloved Church, and also their full constitutional right to make such decision,

and we trust and believe that it will ultimately appear healthful and happy in its results."

Had any one suggested a year since, that such a resolution would ever pass the house of that body, it would have been, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing?"

The Freeman's Journal and Brs. Dabney and White.

We are pleased to reproduce the following candid correction of a mistake by the Editor of the Freeman's Journal.

In response to the first and second of Dr. Robinson's paragraphs, it is our duty to admit that we had not apprehended the latitudinarian accommodations of modern American Presbyterians to the skeptical spirit of the times. The custom and usage of this modern phase of Presbyterianism is a defense to be taken into account, and, in face of it, we withdraw the charge that Dr. White, of Lexington, who was the pastor of the renowned Stonewall Jackson, made concessions not permitted by his communion, or that Dr. Dabney, in narrating the fact, misrepresented that usage. We must, still, be permitted to distrust, and, in fact, to reject, Dr. Dabney's opinion that Stonewall Jackson, afterwards accepted the doctrine that good actions, done by a sincere Christian, are "filthy rags, and have in themselves, no merit in the eyes of God." Jackson's piety was some little of the kind of Shakespeare's Capt. Fluellen. While giving God all honor and thanks, he considered that a stout holding of the pride, and hard fighting, were necessary adjuncts of victory! Nor can we change our conviction that it was neither wise nor generous in Dr. Dabney to give the strong *secular* cast to his life of a hero that men of all religions, and of none, so venerate.

The Short Sermon mainly Professedly endorsed.

The Abbe' Mullois, chaplain to the French Emperor, in a volume on popular sacred eloquence, as cited in the North British Review, gives the following direction to preachers:

"When about to compose your sermon, first study your topic, seizing the salient points of the truth you are going to expound, and then write. But do not stop there—begin afresh. Supposing you have written four pages, reduce them to two, retaining all the thoughts and vigorous ideas of your first draft. On ascending the pulpit, place a watch by your side, and begin thus: 'On Sunday last we said so and so, let us proceed.' Then enter at once upon your subject, cutting it short when the appointed time arrives. People will say that you do not preach long enough, that you tantalize your audience, and rob them of a real pleasure by being so brief. Heed them not, but remain inflexible, for such persons are unconsciously real enemies to religion. Adhere more strictly to the spirit which leads to it, and it earnestly hopes that, under the Providence of God, it may lead to the reunion of these two great Christian bodies."

Resolved, That the Presbytery deems this to be a proper time to express its opinion upon this important matter, and orders this minute to be put upon its record, and published in the religious papers, that its sentiments may be known.

O. M. Jonsson, Stated Clerk.

Rev. W. A. Hall, of New Orleans, La., having accepted the call to become pastor of the Church of Columbus, Ga., correspondents will address him at the latter place.

Rev. Dr. Krebs, we regret to hear, is suffering under a painful and dangerous malady, from which recovery is thought to be doubtful. During the past few years his health has not been firm, and although appearing robust, he has wanted his former vigor. A trip to Europe last summer proved beneficial, but it would not seem to have brought permanent relief. His friends have much anxiety respecting his present condition.

The Presbyterian congregation at Athens, Ga., have made choice of Dr. DeWitt Berkley, of Decatur, as pastor to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. Hoyt.

Rev. Mr. Brauns has declined the call of the First Church of Cincinnati.

Change of relation.—Rev. W. P. Strickland, D. D., has left the Methodist Church and united with the Presbytery of Long Island.

Radicalism a Bond of Church Union.—The Presbyteries of Lillington (N. C.) and Trumansburg (N. Y.) met in convention in Poland, Ohio, on Sept. 25, and during their session adopted the following resolutions unanimously:

"Resolved, That in view of the spirit and action of the two Assemblies of 1866, this Convention is encouraged to hope that at no distant period these two bodies will be organically one.

Resolved, That the hindrances to union are much less now than at any former period.

Additions to the Church in Kanawha.—A correspondent in West Virginia, advises us that at a sacramental meeting recently held at the Kanawha Salines, in which the Rev. B. B. Blair was assisted by the Rev. J. Brown—twelve were added to the church.

Rev. Jonathan Cross, late of Baltimore, Md., has accepted a call to the church, Wheeling, West Virginia. He will enter upon his charge about the first of November.

A State Union Prayer Meeting.—A number of pastors and resident ministers at Springfield, Ill., in the name of the people of that city, have issued a call inviting all Christians in Illinois, of every name, who believe in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, eternal punishment, and justification by faith alone, who desire an outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the churches and the people throughout the State, to assemble at the capital, from Wednesday, November 11, at two o'clock in the afternoon, until Monday, November 19, at twelve o'clock noon, for the purpose of offering united prayers to God.

Mr. Travers's utterance was graceful, gesture plausible, matter profitable, method plain, and his style carried in it *indomitable pietatis—a genus of grace flowing from his sanctified heart*. Some say that the congregation in the Temple *ebbed in the forenoon and flowed in the afternoon*, and that the auditory of Mr. Travers was far the more numerous—the first occasion of emanation between them. But such as knew

Mr. Hooker knew him to be too wise to take exception at such trifles, the rather because the most judicious is always the least part in all auditories.

We are gratified to learn that a revival of great interest is in progress in the Pennsylvania Run Church, in this Presbytery of which Bro. Duncan is stated supply. Rev. W. T. McElroy of this city has preached every day for some ten days, with great acceptance, and the result is that on last Sabbath fifteen persons united with the church on profession of their faith in Christ.

Blackwood's Magazine, for October has been laid upon our table. It contains the following articles, viz. Sir Brook Foss Brooke—Part XVII. Concerning Salads and French Wines. Light & Dark Blue. Nina Balatka Part IV. Alison's History of Europe, 1813-52. Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Cornelius O'Dowd.

Address the Leonard Scott Publishing Company 38 Walker st, New York.

Obituaries extending over ten (10) lines will be charged at the rate of 10¢ per line—eight words to the line.

All communications touching the paper, whether news or otherwise, addressed to

A. DAVIDSON & CO., Publishers,
No. 95, Third Street, Louisville, Ky.

REV. STUART ROBINSON'S NEW BOOK.

DIED,

On Friday, October 12, at 11 o'clock p.m., at Mt. Washington, Ky., SAMUEL P. EMERY, son of Col. Benj. T. Emery, of Galley Rock, Ark, aged 19 years.

At a meeting of the students of Mt. Washington Male and Female Academy, the following were unanimously adopted:

WE, the God, in His mysterious yet all-wise and merciful Providence, has seen fit to remove by our much loved and respected fellow student, Samuel P. Emery.

Resolved, That we yield in meek submission to this afflictive dispensation, and sincerely believe that "the Judge of all the earth is righteous."

Resolved, That we, as a school, in the death of Samuel P. Emery, have lost a kind and beloved friend, a bright and promising student, and a faithful, prompt, and obedient pupil; and in his sudden call from our midst, whilst yet so young, we would learn our own weakness, and seek God to help us "so to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom."

Resolved, That we extend to the deeply stricken father and other relatives our warmest sympathy, and may the very God of grace sustain them.

Resolved, That these resolutions be printed in the *Mountaineer* and *Free Christian Commonwealth*.

WILLIAM HATCHETT, A. J. POSTER, MISS SALLIE WRIGHT, Miss S. DEEN, Committee.

J. W. IIAGEN, Chairman.

In Nicholas County, Ky., July 8, 1866.

Mrs. STEPHEN BRONK, in the 71st year of her age.

They were both pious and consistent members of Carlisle (Ky.) Presbyterian Church, for more than thirty years.

W. H. CLARKE, Western Presbyterian and Methodist Advocate.

He also keeps on hand a full supply of School Books and Stationery.

A. DAVIDSON,

95 Third Street, Louisville, Ky.

Sept. 13, 1866.

WM. L. CLARKE,

Louisville, Ky.

WITH

J. S. LITHGOW & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

Stoves, Castings, & Holloware, Mantles and Grates.

DEALERS IN

Tinplate, Sheet Iron, Copper, and Tinners' Findings.

Sep. 6.

JUST PUBLISHED,

BY THE

Presbyterian Committee of Publication

MAIN STREET, RICHMOND, VA.

THE Presbyterian Committee of Publication announces the following additional 18mo. volumes just issued from the press viz:

MARY CLEARY; or, the Woman that did what she could. Price 50 cents.

IRISH STORIES; f'r thoughtful readers. 25 cents. Price 20 cents.

HELEN MAURICE; or, the Daughter Home. 55 cents.

HANNAH LEE; or, Rest for the Weary. 234 pages. Price 35 cents.

JOHN'S MARK; or, the Woman that did what she could. 220 pages. Price 35 cents.

MY BROTHER BEN. A story f'r boys. 137 pages. Price 40 cents.

ROSE COTTAGE; or, Visit to my Grand-mama. 143 pages. Price 45 cents.

MAY COVERLEY; or, God's dealings with a poor Fatale girl. 262 pages. Price 60 cents.

THE YOUNG ENVELOPE MAKERS. 192 pages. Price 30 cents.

GRACE OGAR; or, How to be happy. 238 pages. Price 65 cents.

ALICE BARLOW; or, Prince in Everything. 263 pages. Price 60 cents.

ELSTON; or, Tasmania Well-doing. 279 pages. Price 65 cents.

PIERRE AND HIS FAMILY. A story f'r the Waldenses. 200 pages. Price 65 cents.

Any of the above volumes sent, post paid, on receipt of price.

E. T. BAIRD, Oct. 4.

Secretary of Publication.

Free Christian Commonwealth

Synod of Missouri.

We had hoped that some of our friends in Missouri would have favored us with a report of the doings of the Synod, for our columns; but as we have not been so favored, we publish an abstract of the proceedings as found in the *Missouri Presbyterian*—also so much of the report of the Committee on the Minutes of the General Assembly as refers to the ecclesiastical matters, so engrossing the minds of the people:

"Immediately after the opening sermon, the Moderator constituted the Synod with prayer, and all the members present were enrolled.

Rev. Mr. Nicolls moved that the names of the signers of the *Declaration and Testimony* be stricken from the roll. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Brookins moved that the Synod adjourn until next October. This motion was voted upon and carried.

Just here, we make two remarks—

(1) An earnest desire was expressed on both sides of the house that, if possible, the Synod might be saved from division. In accordance with this desire, it was understood beforehand that the foregoing resolutions should be offered.

(2) After the announcement of the vote upon the motion to adjourn, the Moderator did not pronounce the body adjourned, for the reason that members, on both sides, seemed to desire a free interchange of views, so as fully to understand what either party wished and intended to do, provided it were definitely agreed to transact no business, but adjourn until next year. Therefore, a protracted *interlocutory* was held, continuing through Wednesday evening, Thursday and part of Friday. During this informal conference, it appeared that some of the Assembly men were endeavoring to prevent the immediate dismemberment of the Synod, in the hope, as it struck us, that by delaying until the meeting of the next Assembly, or until next fall, their party could not lose anything, but might gain very much. Whatever the motive which prompted them to counsel delay, the *Declaration and Testimony* men and their friends evinced a willingness to adjourn at once, without transacting any business. When, however, certain brethren—Finley, Steed, Miller, &c.—plainly and repeatedly stated that, in their opinion, the Synod was already dissolved, insomuch as signers of the Declaration and Testimony had been enrolled—that they could not vote, for they did not recognize us as a Synod, and frankly declared that sooner or later they would organize a new Synod, as directed by the Assembly, it was very evident to the majority that no good, but, very likely, much greater harm would result, by waiting another year. They would not, as they could not, consent to tie their own hands, while brethren on the other side were unwilling to bind themselves to remain quiet also.

The spirit of the majority of the Synod may be gathered from the fact that the following paper was offered by a signer of the Declaration and Testimony, as a substitute for Dr. Montgomery's resolution, and was voted down:

Resolved. (1) That, in the judgment of this Synod, the Synod of Missouri is not dissolved under the order of the Assembly.

Resolved. (2) That in postponing the transaction of business until next October, the Synod sincerely purposes and earnestly hopes, by this measure, to avert the evils of division.

This was offered, it must be remembered, when nothing had been done beyond enrolling the members who were present, and when it was proposed to adjourn without attending to any business. As we have just said, this paper was lost, and Dr. Montgomery's, which breathes much more of subordination to the General Assembly, was almost unanimously adopted, viz:

Resolved. As the sense of this Synod, that, in the action had last night, the Synod of Missouri did not violate nor design to violate, the injunctions of the Assembly, but simply to hold the whole subject in abeyance until after the next General Assembly, and was voted down:

Resolved. (1) That, in the judgment of this Synod, the Synod of Missouri is not dissolved under the order of the Assembly.

Resolved. (2) That in postponing the transaction of business until next October, the Synod sincerely purposes and earnestly hopes, by this measure, to avert the evils of division.

This was offered, it must be remembered, when nothing had been done beyond enrolling the members who were present, and when it was proposed to adjourn without attending to any business.

As we have just said, this paper was lost, and Dr. Montgomery's, which breathes much more of subordination to the General Assembly, was almost unanimously adopted, viz:

Resolved. As the sense of this Synod, that, in the action had last night, the Synod of Missouri did not violate nor design to violate, the injunctions of the Assembly, but simply to hold the whole subject in abeyance until after the next General Assembly, and was voted down:

In a word, then, we all felt that the division must take place. We went back to the beginning. A change of votes on the motion to adjourn, was allowed, and that motion was declared to be lost. Then, Mr. Nicolls renewed his motion to direct the Clerk to strike from the roll the names of the signers of the *Declaration and Testimony*.

Ruling Elder D. H. Bishop, who is not a signer of the *Declaration and Testimony*, offered the following as a substitute for the resolution of Mr. Nicolls.

Inasmuch as private judgment is both a right and a duty, a right which no man can surrender, and remain a Protestant, and a duty which cannot be neglected without sin and crime.

Resolved. That the signers of the *Declaration and Testimony* are not schismatics, and rebels against ecclesiastical authority, but have simply exercised a great Protestant right, and discharged a solemn duty; and

Resolved. That the Synod, having no evidence that these brethren are not in good and regular standing in their respective Presbyteries and Sessions, cannot, without violating the constitution of the Church, deny them their seats.

This paper was adopted.

Mr. Nicolls and others then quietly withdrew and organized another Synod.

The Committee on the General Assembly made the following report which was adopted:

The Committee on the Minutes of the Assembly would respectfully report, that they have examined the same as carefully as the limited time allotted to them would permit. They find that great matters, vitally effecting the purity of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church and its principles and form of government, were entertained and passed upon by the Assembly; and that to many of its acts they are compelled to enter their grave disapproval. They find that in the very opening of its sessions an order was passed under the se-

vere application of the previous question, unjustly excluding from the body Drs. Smart Robinson and S. R. Wilson, and the venerable C. A. Wickliffe and Mark Hardin, Commissioners from the Louisville Presbytery; and that the preamble to such order contains the cruel intimation that there was the strongest ground for believing that one of them would have been excluded from the functions of the gospel ministry, if he Presbytery of which he was a member and coadjutor, had faithfully discharged its duty. That an intimation, so ungenerous, so unchristian and so untrue, should have been entertained, and is spread upon the permanent minutes of the highest court of the Prebyterian Church, a church whose inspiration guards with sleepless care the reputation of all its members, is matter of the greatest wonder and the deepest humiliation.

The report of the Special Committee of seven, in the matter of the Presbytery of Louisville, and of the Gurley resolutions, which were subsequently engrossed upon it, declaring the *Declaration and Testimony* to be a slander against the church, seditious in its character and aims, and its adoption by a church court an act of rebellion against the authority of the General Assembly, and summoning the signers of the *Declaration and Testimony* to appear before the next Assembly to answer for what they have done in that matter, have been so repeatedly and fully exposed in their unconstitutional features, and so recently felt in their terrible results, that your committee do not feel called upon to reproduce them. One of the reasons assigned by Dr. Gurley for the adoption of his paper, and ordered by the Assembly to be spread upon their minutes, is that it gives the signers of the *Declaration and Testimony*, time for repentance, and yet without repentence they are still permitted to preach the gospel, and moderate church Sessions. It directs that they shall not be permitted to sit as members of any church court higher than the Session, and yet they were authorized by a formal vote of the Assembly to continue to occupy their seats in that body, the highest court of the church, after the passage of the Gurley paper. Orders so arbitrary, and inconsistent, issuing from no principle, but views of expediency and a determination to retain power, show the urgent necessity of a return to the constitutional provision that process against a gospel minister shall always be instituted in the Presbytery of which he is a member.

Your committee are compelled to express their strongest condemnation of the action of the Assembly in regard to the Walnut Street Church, under the care of the Louisville Presbytery. That action orders that three individuals, D. McNaughton, B. F. Avery and Jas. A. Leech shall be recognized and acknowledged as ruling elders in said church, while "the cause" as declared by the protestants to the action "was not before the Assembly either upon complaint, appeal, reference, or review and control—in one or other of which ways only could it be regularly brought under their jurisdiction."

The objections to these different acts of the Assembly have been so clearly and fully embodied in the different protests spread upon the minutes and published in the papers, and so thoroughly discussed, that your committee do not feel it incumbent upon them to dwell upon them now.

The committee find in the minutes of the Assembly, the record of action looking to the union of the Old and New School Presbyteries;—also, action adverse to the union of said Old School Church with the branch of the Presbyterian family organized in the Southern States. The Synod feel called upon to express their deep regret, and their strong disapprobation of the course of the General Assembly in seeming to ignore agreement on fundamental doctrines of faith and church polity as a basis of union, and making similarity of political views, the foundation of ecclesiastical unity.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth
One effect of the Bible is to educate the Human Mind and to turn out the High-style of Man.

This may seem to have been implied in what we have already said. But we wish here to take a different and varied view of the subject; although the Christian religion is by far the mightiest and most benign of all the powers that operate upon the human mind, yet without high intelligence in its teachers and professors its influence is comparatively small. Religion, without intelligence, is not likely to reach all orders of mind nor to exercise a very predominating power in the world aside from and beyond the power of religion itself. It built the stately and ponderous verse of John Milton. Its colorings appear at times even upon the pages of Shakespeare. It breathes like the freshness and fragrance of spring in Cowper, and Byron too gathered his flowers from, and smells the odors of ancient Palestine.

And what is true of poetry is equally true of prose. It warms and enlightens the morality and goes sounding along in the pages of the Spectator and Rambler. As it infuses justice and generosity into statesmanship, it inflames, adorns, and enriches the eloquence of Burke. It sways the periods and strengthens the proud and lofty sentences of Pitt. It sways the rhetoric and indites the reasonings of Fox. Its life and modes of thought pervade the great mass of the greatest of English works. The whole range of British literature, whether in Europe, Asia, or America, has partaken largely and vitally in the sentiment, morality and other characteristics of the Bible. Nothing has ever stirred the soul to such depths, nor invaded it so extensively and powerfully with benefits and blessings as that Book.

Look at those countries where it is not the common gift to the people, and the general mind is a pool of a thousand years' stagnation. No change and no

the compound operations of large knowledge and moral force.

The Bible is, not only the source of the greatest and most essential of all knowledge, but it sheds a light upon all other departments and principles of knowledge. It introduces the student into the arena of God's greatest works and most mysterious ways; and marching hand in hand with all human knowledge, it exhibits to the human eye a clearness of vision, and extent of grandeur, of sublimity, of splendor, and variety of objects, far outstripping the possibilities of mere natural philosophy. Taking its stand at the great central throne, it sweeps in vision the vast and wonderful domains of creation, Providence and Redemption.

It begins with principles clear to reason and natural to the human soul, because it begins with a personal God as the Great First Cause of all things. And not merely as a cold philosophical idea, but as a heavenly father to all his children. This rich and glorious idea of divine personality is the great leading light amid all darkness, and perplexity of life. It threads the way mad, it chases the cold, numbing shades of pantheism from the earth. It lets the sun of day shine through to animate the efforts and beam the light of intelligence upon all essential subjects. It gives end and aim to human existence, labors, and prospects.

A personal God accounts for our accountability, and assigns reasons and motives for a right and holy character while pantheism mocks at the bare idea.

The Christian mind starting from a point that overlooks immensity, it is neither deceived by the pretensions nor caught in the snare of a bewildering philosophy. Clearly discerning those points where clouds and darkness limit the human view, where perverted learning runs mad, and where men have rushed recklessly into the fogs and quagmires of atheism, it runs no risks of delusion and fears no triumphs of infidel jubilation.

The Bible, therefore, has much to do in guiding the intellect in the paths of science, in holding it steady and true as it climbs upward along the line of immensity, or as it drives its investigations amid the materials of our own sphere.

What therefore can be a greater mistake than to suppose that the Bible has nothing to do in guiding, training, and educating the intellect of man? For what can more evidently enlarge, elevate, sharpen and polish the mind than the great revelations made in the divine word? What is there so high, what is there so profound, what so vast in extent, what so wonderful in power, and what so incomparable in wisdom and knowledge as God himself? The study of him and his works should ever move in parallel lines. This ennobles the mind, deepens and widens the channels of thought, whets the mental faculties to their keenest edge, brightens and disciplines the soul far beyond any single materiality of study. The subjects of revelation demand the profoundest studies and richly repay the studious beyond all other matters of investigation.

There is no subject so profound, so full of illustration and exhaustless in its stores of instruction as Christian Theology. As to the wealth of mind and as to its effect upon men in keeping them from moral and mental bankruptcy, the Bible is the California and Australia of the human intellect. It abounds in mines of wealth which enriched generations past and will exhaustlessly enrich those that are to come. To the poet and historian, the theologian and philosopher, and to men of all kinds and callings it is alike and infinitely valuable. Hence our English literature is full of the riches and inspiration of the divine word. Let all English poetry be destroyed which has borrowed suggestions, illustrations, and allusions from the Bible, and there will not be much left. It built the stately and ponderous verse of John Milton. Its colorings appear at times even upon the pages of Shakespeare. It breathes like the freshness and fragrance of spring in Cowper, and Byron too gathered his flowers from, and smells the odors of ancient Palestine.

And what is true of poetry is equally true of prose. It warms and enlightens the morality and goes sounding along in the pages of the Spectator and Rambler. As it infuses justice and generosity into statesmanship, it inflames, adorns, and enriches the eloquence of Burke. It sways the periods and strengthens the proud and lofty sentences of Pitt. It sways the rhetoric and indites the reasonings of Fox. Its life and modes of thought pervade the great mass of the greatest of English works. The whole range of British literature, whether in Europe, Asia, or America, has partaken largely and vitally in the sentiment, morality and other characteristics of the Bible. Nothing has ever stirred the soul to such depths, nor invaded it so extensively and powerfully with benefits and blessings as that Book.

Look at those countries where it is not the common gift to the people, and the general mind is a pool of a thousand years' stagnation. No change and no

upward movement in the masses. Old things do not pass away and all things do not become new. The monotony of thought and life do not change. What an escape from priest and pope to an intelligent worship of God? What an escape from Mount Olympus to Mount Zion—from the rabble deities of Homer and Virgil to the Jehovah of the Bible.

What a light is the Bible to scatter the darkness of atheism and to reconcile man to his own existence? However we may justly honor old Greece and Rome for our classic learning and mental discipline, the divinity of the Bible shines out so sublimely grand and so conspicuously clear beyond all that men have praised in Grecian and Roman literature, that any attempt at comparison looks like an attempt at the profane and ludicrous. The one has some brightness and beauty, some sublimity and excellence mixed up with great masses of heathenish superstitions and abominations, while the other shines all over in the light of a literature of unparalleled excellence and at the same time with the spirit of the infinite God. It is but the reflections of his infinite perfections.

"As Good as a Christian."

"I fear that my husband will stumble into hell over the faults of professing Christians." Such was the remark of a lady whose husband belonged to that large class in every community that lives on the faults and inconsistencies of the children of God. They claim that they are as good as Christians, and look for the Christian's joy in the world to come.

It need not for a moment be denied that Christians have faults, and are not as consistent as they ought to be. Every true believer in Christ will tell you that he is a greater sinner than you think he is. He knows the secret faults of his heart. You only know the inconsistencies of his outward conduct.

And yet there is a heaven-wide difference between the most unworthy child of God and the most moral and upright man who is not a Christian. The one will be saved; the other, unless he repents, will be lost. The one has consecrated himself to the service of God, and has the promise of God's strength to help him purify his heart and life. His heavenly Father is working in him day by day the work of sanctification. The other is living without God, living for self; and not simply standing still in his wickedness, but day by day growing worse—hardening himself more and more against God.

The assertion so often made by men of unregenerate hearts, "I am as good as a Christian," is made as an excuse for not becoming a Christian. It is made to cheat the conscience, which is telling all those who make such a boast, "You are not as good as a Christian." Well indeed will it be for those thus deceiving themselves, if they open their eyes to their true state, ere they stumble into hell over the faults of professed Christians.

We attempt not to palliate or excuse these faults. Christians ought to give much less occasion to the world to find fault with them. Every true Christian is seeking just this, that he may so let his light shine that men may take knowledge of him that he has been with Jesus.

But every man must give an account of himself to God; and tried by this rule, where do you stand? What if the world were hypocrites, and going down to eternal death, that would not alter your own responsibility to seek the kingdom of heaven, to give your heart to the Saviour, and serve him all your days. If I were quite swollen and red, and his voice trembled; but that was with weakness, for he had not eaten for twenty-four hours. As Henry, with a low faltering voice, begged for a little charity, the gentleman stopped, and his kind heart melted with compassion as he looked into the fair countenance of the poor boy, and saw the deep blush which spread over his face, and lisened to the modest, humble tones which accompanied his petition.

"You do not look like a boy that has been accustomed to beg his bread," said he, kindly laying his hand on the boy's shoulder, "what has driven you to this step?"

"Indeed," answered Henry, his tears beginning to flow afresh, "Indeed, I was not born in this condition. But the misfortunes of my father and the sickness of my mother have driven me to the necessity now."

"Who is your father?" inquired the gentleman, still more interested.

"My father was a rich merchant of this city, but he became bond-man for a friend, who soon failed, and he was entirely ruined. He could not live long after this loss, and in one month he died of grief, and his death was more dreadful than any of our trouble. My mother, my little brother and myself soon sank into the lowest depths of poverty."

"Nothing can be done for you," said the boy, "but to go to school, and learn to earn your living."

"I have not had any work for several weeks."

"The tears, and the simple moving language of the poor boy touched a chord in the breast of the stranger that was accustomed to frequent vibrations."

"Where does your mother live, my boy?" said he in a husky voice. "Is it far from here?"

"She lives in the last house in this street, sir," said Henry. "You can see it from here in the third block, on the left hand side."

"Have you sent for a physician?"

"No, sir," said the boy, sorrowfully shaking his head. "I had no money to pay either for a physician or medicine."

"Here," said the stranger, drawing some pieces of silver from his pocket, "here are three dollars; take them and run immediately for a physician."

Henry's eyes flashed with gratitude; he received the money with a stammer and almost inaudible voice, but with a look of the warmest gratitude, he vanished.

The benevolent stranger instantly sought the dwelling of the sick widow. He entered a little room in which he could see nothing but a few implements of female labor—a miserable table, an old bureau, and a little cot which stood in one corner, on which the invalid lay. She appeared weak and almost exhausted, and on the bed at her feet sat a little boy crying as if his heart would break.

Deeply moved at the sight, the stranger drew near the bedside of the invalid, and feigning to be a physician, inquired into the nature of her disease.

The symptoms were explained in a few words,

when the widow, with a deep sigh, added: "Oh, my sickness has a deeper cause, and one which is beyond the physician's art to cure. I am a mother. I see my children sinking deeper in want, which I have no means of relieving. My sickness is of the heart, and even death is dreadful to me, for it wakes the thought of the misery into which my children would be plunged, if—"

Her emotions checked her utterance, and the tears flowed unrestrained down.

her checks. But the pretended physician spoke so consolingly to her, and manifested such warm sympathy for her condition, that the heart of the woman throbbed with an unvoiced pleasure.

"Do not despair," said the stranger; "think only of recovery and of preserving a life that is so precious to your children. Can I write a prescription here?"

The woman took a little prayer-book from the hands of a child who sat with her on the bed, and tearing off a blank leaf, "I have no other," she said; "perhaps this will do."

The stranger took a pencil from his pocket, and wrote a